

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/811,160	03/26/2004	Eric Joseph Bilskie	9596	1981	
27752	7590 12/14/2006	•	EXAMINER		
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY			PETERSON, KENNETH E		
	JAL PROPERTY DIVIS LL BUSINESS CENTER		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE			3724		
CINCINNATI	, OH 45224		DATE MAIL ED 12/14/200		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	_
ÀI	4
17	- (

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/811,160	BILSKIE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kenneth E. Peterson	3724		

	Kenneth E. Peterson	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 27 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THI						
1! \( \sum \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice o wing replies: (1) an amendment, a stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	of Appeal. To avoid ab affidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	).	•				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. stutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	oliones with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	a filad within two man	the of the date			
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
AMENDMENTS  The respect among the filled offer a finel rejection.	but prior to the date of filing a brid	of will not be entered	hocauso *			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NC w);	OTE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	•	gected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		compliant Amondmon	(DTOL 224)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompilani Amendmeni	. (PTOL-324).			
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li> </ul>		timely filed amends	ent canceling			
the non-allowable claim(s).	nowable if subtritted in a separate	, amery med amendi	icin caricening			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		vill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			•			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a l d sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will raw it or other evidence	not be entered is necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	nils to provide a (1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	ched.			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by See attached.</li> </ol>		in condition for allowa	ance because:			
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
13. Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/811,160

Art Unit: 3724

1. Applicant argues that his transport element is "integral" with the apparatus. Given that Applicant's transport element is movable relative to the apparatus, and is no doubt removable by disassembly of the device, the term "integral" must be given certain breadth. In this case, the appropriate breadth is "not easily removed nor intended to be removed from the apparatus". In the case of Watanabe, there are two embodiments, a truck on rails, and a conveyor, both set forth on line 33 of column 4. The conveyor is certainly not easily removable from the apparatus. The truck, in combination with the rails it rides on, are also not easily removable. Mind you that wherever those rails lead to, they are still part of the apparatus, so even if the truck travels across the factory floor on the rails, it is still part of the same apparatus, since it is confined to the rails that are part of the apparatus. To distinguish over these references, Applicant needs to focus more on the structural differences between his transport element and those of Watanabe.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER